

## PROPOSED PROJECT - EVOLUTION OF THE PROJECT CONCEPT

The project description contained within the Draft EIR referred to "Plan A" as the proposed project. Plan A would have created three separate facilities located at Half Moon Bay, El Granada and Montara to provide secondary treatment of wastewater for common collection and conveyance to a single outfall either at Half Moon Bay or Miramontes Point. The proposed Plan A was contrasted in the DEIR with Plan F which specified construction of a single regional facility at the site of the Half Moon Bay treatment plant for treatment and disposal of the entire Mid-Coastside sewage. The Basin Plan for San Francisco Bay specifies a single regional treatment facility and chiefly for this reason the State review agencies have encouraged the joint sewage authorities to seek Plan F rather than Plan A as originally proposed. The direct impacts of Plan F differ from those of Plan A with respect to facilities construction and to some degree in matters of cost and cost allocation among the member districts. However, the water quality impacts of both plans are essentially identical. Both Plans A and F as described in the DEIR will accommodate a certain population increase. Since both Plans A and F are designed to serve the same level of anticipated growth, the indirect impacts of either Plan should also be the same.

The problem of cost and cost allocation however, raises an issue of political sensitivity in the Mid-Coastside area. Plan F would require substantial new facilities construction at Half Moon Bay and the provision of an ultimate capacity significantly in excess of the State E-0 funding population level. If strictly applied, the State Clean Water Grant Guidelines would allow full funding for the conveyance system yet far less than full funding for the treatment facilities themselves due to the E-0 population limit exclusion. Since the districts at present have a hydraulic or "design" capacity for 1.8 mgd, they feel that the large amount of expense necessitated by a large local share of the Plan F facilities would pose an undue and unnecessary hardship on the community. The present facilities located within the three districts could form the nucleus of a limited upgrading program resulting in lower local expense. This limited upgrading has become known as "bareboned" Plan A.

The present posture of the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM) is that they are willing to seek Plan F, regionalization, if the State will grant full eligibility for the new facilities. On the other hand, if eligibility is denied, SAM will seek the "bareboned" Plan A, local treatment. The decision as to the specific facilities configuration is largely a matter of determination of local costs. The members of SAM feel that either Plan A or Plan F will fulfill the fundamental water quality objectives of the project and as such they believe that their principal obligation to the Clean Water legislation (PL 92-500) is fulfilled; their secondary obligation to their constituency is to seek clean water compliance with the least amount of incremental economic burden.

Bareboned Plan A differs from Plan A as originally described in the DEIR in that it would rely on upgrading and renovation of existing facilities rather than construction of new facilities in each locality wherever possible. Although specific engineering specifications are not available during Step 1 of the Clean Water Grant process, upgrading would typically mean the use of add-on equipment, a program of repair and the utilization of earthworks with impervious liners rather than more permanent structures of reinforced concrete. The pipeline under bareboned Plan A would be identical to the pipeline under Plan A as originally described.

#### Costs

Exact cost projections for Plan F and bareboned Plan A are not available since the detailed estimation and revenue program must await the final project selection. For purposes of comparison however, the engineer has provided rough estimates which are presented in the accompanying table. That table presents the annual cost per household for the design population of 20,000 persons. That population would be achieved around 1985. The cost presented includes amortization of construction costs with provision for a capital recovery fund in addition to operation and maintenance expenses for the treatment and conveyance facilities alone. Costs for maintenance of the collector system which is presently in use are not included in the figures below. The costs for these items would typically be recovered through service charges rather than as property tax.

As may be seen, Plan F would represent the smallest local cost to all three districts provided that eligibility for 87.5% State and Federal funding were granted up to the full 1.8 mgd hydraulic capacity. With only E-0 eligibility, (1.24 mgd) Plan F would represent a significant increase in cost to local households - 9% more than the burden would be under full eligibility funding.

#### Exhibit 1 ANNUAL PROJECT COST PER HOUSEHOLD

	Half Moon Bay	Granada	Montara
Plan A	\$ 73	\$ 138	\$ 125
Plan F full funding	96	96	96
Plan F E-0 funding	105	105	105

Source: Bond payment, O&M, Capital Recovery estimates by engineer.  
Household cost attribution by State Water Resources Control Board (March 1976).

The major incentive for adoption of bareboned Plan A in the absence of full funding for Plan F would be expected to come from Half Moon Bay. As the table shows, partially funded Plan F represents the maximum local share burden to Half Moon Bay; Plan A represents the maximum burden to the other districts. Bareboned Plan A is also more expensive than Plan F with full funding, but the cost falls more heavily on only Granada and Montara while Half Moon Bay, which has fairly complete facilities at present, would bear only minor expense.

## FACILITIES IMPACT

The facilities construction for Plan F would take place within the existing compound of the Half Moon Bay treatment plant. There would be no significant impact on any existing or proposed land use from Plan F construction. Plan A, on the other hand, would require significant new construction in El Granada. Current plans suggest that the new treatment facilities would be located immediately to the north of the present pumping station at Princeton. Although this would remove the proposed facilities from a fault zone, it would locate them in close proximity to several archaeological sites and within the area proposed for the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve Park of the County of San Mateo. The facilities at El Granada would not be great in extent - roughly one-third of an acre - and could be sited in such a manner as to minimize adverse impacts on cultural resources and so as to interfere only slightly with the planned park.

At present, the "project" under consideration is essentially the concept of Mid-Coastside Wastewater Management. Selection of the apparent best alternative takes into account the flexibility of alternatives A or F. Should Plan F be adopted, the facilities impact at the Granada site would be limited to pipeline construction alone. Should Plan A be adopted, the problem of exact plant siting and subsequent property acquisition would pose an additional constraint to the next phase of actual facilities design, but the problem is not insurmountable.